1

JOINDER IN NOTICE OF RELATED CASE, CASE NO. C-02-5570

1 | 2 | an 3 | ci 4 | is 5 | ov 6 | ci 7 | ca 8 | in 1

///

///

///

Civil case defendants Lakireddy Bali Reddy, Vijay Kumar Lakireddy, Prasad Lakireddy and Jayaprakash Lakireddy are also defendants in the Reddy criminal actions. Although the civil action also names additional co-conspirator defendants, each of those additional defendants is either a close family member of one of the criminal case defendants or is a Reddy family-owned business which is alleged to have profited unlawfully from the overlapping criminal and civil case allegations of wrongdoing. In addition, each of the individual plaintiffs in this civil case was a victim of the criminal schemes alleged in the criminal case and is a potential witness in the upcoming criminal trial of defendant Prasad Lakireddy.

The civil case and the criminal case involve overlapping factual and legal allegations, including RICO allegations that the criminal defendants and others engaged in an unlawful conspiracy to bring Indian nationals to the United States, that defendants employed and exploited such Indian nationals, and that defendants engaged in sexual intercourse with minor Indian nationals.

The proceedings in the civil case will be closely related to the criminal case proceedings in several respects. In particular, because of the pendency of the criminal trial against defendant Prasad Lakireddy (who has retained separate counsel from the other Reddy defendants in the civil action), the scope and timing of discovery in the civil case will have to be coordinated both with the criminal prosecutor (who plaintiffs understand does not want civil discovery of plaintiffs to go forward that would not otherwise be available before a criminal trial) and with the criminal defendants (who have stated that they intend to assert a Fifth Amendment privilege to avoid responding to discovery until all criminal proceedings are finally resolved — including defendant Lakireddy Bali Reddy's pending motion for sentence reduction). In addition, plaintiffs in the civil case — many of whom are potential witnesses in the criminal case — have significant privacy and confidentiality concerns that should be resolved consistently in the two cases.

1	For these reasons, plaintiffs agree with defendants that the cases are related, and	
2	plaintiffs believe that assignment of the civil class action litigation to the same judge as is	
3	presiding over the criminal proceedings is just and proper, will further judicial economy, and	
4	will promote an efficient determination of both actions.	
5		
6	Dated: November 26, 2002 MICHAEL RUBIN SCOTT A. KRONLAND	
7	REBEKAH B. EVENSON Altshuler, Berzon, Nussbaum, Rubin & Demain	
8	Attshulet, Belzon, Nussoaum, Ruom & Bellam	
9	By: /s/ Scott A. Kronland	
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Jane Doe I, et. al.	
11	F:\Reddy\Global Case\Pleadings\JoinderReRelatedCaseNotice. Nov.25.02.final.wpd	
12	1. Accord (Global Case a leadings solider Reference Case Folice: 1404.25.52.111ai.wpd	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

PROOF OF SERVICE 1 2 Code of Civil Procedure §1013 3 **CASE:** Jane Doe I, et al. v. Lakireddy Bali Reddy, et al., **CASE NO:** United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C-02-5570 5 I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 177 Post Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California 94108. On November 26, 2002, I served the following document (copy attached): 8 PLAINTIFFS' JOINDER IN NOTICE OF RELATED CASE on the parties, through their attorneys of record, by placing true copies thereof in sealed envelopes addressed as shown below for service as designated below: 10 By First Class Mail: I am readily familiar with the practice of Altshuler, Berzon for the collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. I 11 caused each such envelope, with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid, to be deposited in a 12 recognized place of deposit of the U.S. Mail in San Francisco, California, for collection and mailing to the office of the addressee on the date shown herein. 13 **ADDRESSEE PARTY** 14 Α William S. Berland Defendants 15 Ferguson & Berland 1816 Fifth Street Berkeley, CA 94710-1915 16 17 Α Michael W Bolechowski **Defendants** 2000 Powell Street, Suite 1425 Emeryville, CA 94608 18 19 Α Jonathan Bass **Defendants** Corblentz, Patch, Duffy & Bass 20 222 Kearny Street, 7th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108-4510 21 George J. Cotsirilos, Jr. Defendant Vijay Kumar A 22 Cotsirilos & Campisano Lakireddy 632 Commercial Street, Third Floor 23 San Francisco, CA 94111 Paul D. Wolf 24 Defendant Prasad Lakireddy Α Law Offices of Paul Delano Wolf 25 1212 Broadway, Tenth Floor Oakland, CA 94612 26 Ted W. Cassman Defendant Lakireddy Bali Α Cooper, Arguedas & Cassman 27 Reddy 5900 Hollis Street, Suite N 28 Emeryville, CA 94608

Stephen D. Corrigan Plaintiff in Case No. CR-00-Α Assistant United States Attorney 1301 Clay Street, Suite 340-S Oakland, CA 94612-5217 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this November 26, 2002, at San Francisco, California. Holly Miller

Case 3:02-cv-05570-WHA Document 6 Filed 11/26/02 Page 5 of 5